

SENATOR BEUTLER: Madam President, members of the Legislature, I am in a particular quandary on this particular item because I do think that attempting to define better the contribution side of the problem is something that is worth pursuing. However, having looked at the problem some in the past, it seemed quite clear to me that as between trying to tie down contributions as opposed to generally trying to limit expenditures, that far and away the most effective campaign reform would be to succeed in limiting expenditures, and this particular bill of Senator Baack's is proposing a really unique proposition. It is a proposition whereby the limitations are voluntary on expenditures and yet it is done in such a way that public funds, which has always been a big bugaboo, probably will not be spent to ever put the system into effect. Now that is...if we can refine this concept, this expenditure limitation concept to succeed in limiting expenditures without spending any public funds, and that is what we are about here, that will be an enormous accomplishment. It will be an extremely effective accomplishment, and it will put us at the forefront of campaign reform in this country, and, you can bet, there will also be a Supreme Court case on the system. But if the court approves the system, we will have succeeded in doing what nobody in the nation has succeeded in doing, and that is devising an effective campaign expenditure limitation system that does not, in effect, in practical effect, in all probably, involve the actual expenditure of public funds because of the practical aspect of the bill which tells you that no candidate is going to be...is going to want to be the cause of somebody expending public funds. You know, the practical aspect of it is that if we properly refine this, I think we can devise a system where nobody will want to have attached to them the onus of having not...have chosen not to abide by the campaign expenditure limitations in the bill. So I guess what I am saying is that I see this side of what we are trying to do as being so important and so critical, that despite the fact that I agree with Senator Ashford, I do not want to jeopardize that either, one, constitutionally because it is not clear though what he is proposing as far as an aggregate limitation is concerned as possible, and I think we need to go back and look at the Buckley case very closely because it did say a lot about the limitation of campaign contributions, and, of course, if you get to the point where you are limiting all sorts of groups, then it becomes an expenditure limitation in effect, and also to take a practical look at what the political consequences are of attaching this kind of amendment, which is sure to attract